

Appl. No. 10/690,757
Amendment dated: January 31, 2007
Reply to OA of: October 16, 2006

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the claims to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 2, 4-6 and 18-22 are allowed and that claims 3 and 9-12 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 3 is dependent upon claim 1. Claim 3 has been written in independent form by adding the limitation from claim 3 to claim 1. Therefore claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon are now allowable. Claim 3 has been canceled from the application as redundant.

Allowable dependent claim 9 has been placed into condition for allowance by adding the limitation from claim 1, from which it previously depended and is now in independent form and in condition for allowance. Similarly, allowable dependent claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the claims on which it depends placing claim 10 in independent form and in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended claim 14 to include all of the limitations from original claim 15 and which is fully supported by the specification as originally filed (see page 24, lines 3-15). Claim 15 has been canceled from the present application in view of the amendment to claim 14 and the redundancy of the claim. Claim 23 has been amended to replace "a bulky dirt trapping member" with "a filter" in view of the statement made by the Examiner with respect to the objection to claim 3 on page 5 of the outstanding Official Action that a filter installed on an inlet is not obvious.

The objection to claims 3, 9-12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of dependent claim 3 which now makes independent claim 1 allowable. Applicants have rewritten claims 9 and 10 into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 has been canceled from the present application in view of the redundancy

Appl. No. 10/690,757
Amendment dated: January 31, 2007
Reply to OA of: October 16, 2006

of the claim.

Applicants most respectfully submit that all of the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 USC 112 and clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1, 7, 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dyson has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dyson has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claims 14-17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bair has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

Applicants submit that it is also believed that claims 7, 8, 11-13, 15-17 and 23 indirectly or directly depending on claim 1 or 14, are allowable for the same reasons indicated with respect to the claims 1 and 14, and further because of the additional features recited therein which, when taken alone and/or in combination with the features recited in claims 1 and 14, remove the invention defined therein further from the disclosures made in the cited reference. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that the prior art rejections be withdrawn.

Applicants further submit that should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects, in order to place the case in condition for an early allowance, it is most respectfully requested that such amendment(s) or correction(s) be made by an Examiner's Amendment so that the application may be placed in condition for allowance.


Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Appl. No. 10/690,757
Amendment dated: January 31, 2007
Reply to OA of: October 16, 2006

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: 
Richard E. Fichter
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080
REF/cjw
A01.wpd
January 31, 2007